

**Minutes of the meeting of the  
Board of Directors of the College of Policing  
held at The Kia Oval  
on 17 November 2021 at 11:05**

**Present**
**Attendance  
2020/21**

Nick Herbert	Chair	5/5
David Bamber	Non-Executive Director	4/5
Paul Griffiths	Non-Executive Director	4/5
Andy Marsh	Chief Executive Officer	2/2
Clare Minchington	Non-Executive Director	4/5
Stephen Mold	Non-Executive Director	4/5
Alexis Poole	Non-Executive Director	5/5
Ian Wylie	Non-Executive Director	5/5

**Apologies**

Neil Basu	Non-Executive Director	1/2
Jackie Smith	Non-Executive Director	3/5
Professor Robina Shah	Adviser to the Board on DEI	3/5

**Executive in attendance**

Nick Bayley	Director of Enabling Services
Jo Noakes	Director of Workforce Development
Bernie O'Reilly	Deputy Chief Constable
Iain Raphael	Director of Operational Standards
Rachel Tuffin	Director of Knowledge and Innovation

**Staff in attendance**

Anna Douglas	Staff Officer
Kate Fromant	Head of Corporate Governance
Camille Giffard	Governance Manager
Martin Tunstall	Executive Policy Adviser
James Walker	Staff Officer

## Part one – Preliminary items

### 01-COP-NOV21 **Welcome and administration**

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, noting that the meeting had been duly convened and a quorum was present.
- 1.2. Apologies for absence were received from Neil Basu, Robina Shah and Jackie Smith.
- 1.3. There were no declarations of interest.
- 1.4. No items were raised for discussion under Any Other Business.

### 02-COP-NOV21 **Approvals**

#### **Minutes of the meeting on 22 September 2021**

- 2.1. One amendment was requested, that the reference to the British Medical Association at paragraph 6.10 be changed to the General Medical Council. No other comments were received prior to or raised in the meeting. The minutes of the meeting on 22 September were approved subject to this amendment.

#### **ACTION: Camille Giffard**

Amend the minutes at paragraph 6.10 to read General Medical Council in place of British Medical Association.

#### **Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the minutes of 22 September 2021 subject to replacing the reference to British Medical Association with General Medical Council at paragraph 6.10.

#### **Decisions under Urgency Procedures**

- 2.2. The College Chair reminded board members that recruitment was underway to fill four vacancies for independent Non-Executive Directors (NEDs). Twelve people had been interviewed, with the panel unanimously recommending appointment of four of the candidates.
- 2.3. The Nominations and Remuneration Committee (NRC) Chair had taken a Chair's action to strongly recommend to the Board approval of those four candidates for submission to the Home Secretary as preferred applicants for appointment. He added that all candidates interviewed were scored on competencies and the candidates being recommended received the highest scores.
- 2.4. Board members queried, bearing in mind terms of appointment would start at the same time, how to avoid simultaneous departure of all independent NEDs in future. It was agreed that initial appointments should be recommended for the full three years but, at the time of renewal, the Home Secretary should be requested to stagger those terms.

- 2.5. Board members agreed the NRC Chair's Action.
- 2.6. The College Chair thanked Clare Minchington, Jackie Smith and Ian Wylie for their valuable contributions; their experience would be missed.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the four candidates for submission to the Home Secretary as preferred applicants for appointment, as recommended by the NRC Chair's Action.

03-COP-NOV21

#### **Action points from the meeting on 22 September 2021**

- 3.1. Actions 1, 2 and 3 were red, and action 4 amber, all awaiting the conclusion of the Non-Executive Director (NED) recruitment. Action 5 was amber and ongoing, with a revised due date of January 2022. Action 6 was not yet due. The remaining three actions were suggested complete.
- 3.2. Board members sought assurance that the NEDs would be appointed in time for the January board meeting. It had been emphasised to the Home Office that the Board would otherwise not be quorate and unable to make decisions. It was hoped that the clear recommendations and due diligence completed would help to expedite the process, as no issues had been flagged in relation to any candidate. It was noted that the recruitment process had been raised as an issue by all Arms' Length Bodies (ALs) at a recent meeting of ALB Audit and Risk Committee chairs.
- 3.3. In relation to progress of action 4, a date had been set for Alexis Poole to host a Tea and Talk in December. Further board engagement would be arranged once the new NEDs were in post.

#### **ACTION: Camille Giffard**

Update the action log as agreed.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the 'Action Points' template.

04-COP-NOV21

#### **Chair's Report**

- 4.1. The Chair reported that the Fundamental Review (FR) findings had been presented to Chiefs' Council, Police and Crime Commissioners, and the National Policing Board. The Policing Leadership element received a positive reception from policing colleagues, the Home Secretary and the Policing Minister. A joint programme was agreed in relation to this. It was timely to now present this publicly, with the precise approach to be discussed with the Communications team, so the College's proposed strategic direction could underpin the 2022-23 Business Plan. 8 December had been identified as a possible date for launch.
- 4.2. Board members noted that this was the day before the Bravery Awards, which could dilute the effect of the launch on

social media. It also coincided with the first day of Chiefs' Council. Andy Marsh (AM) advised that he would be attending both events and would draw attention to the FR at both.

- 4.3. The Chair noted that the College was perceived now as on the move, with the appointment of the new CEO and launch of the FR.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the Chair's update.

05-COP-NOV21

**Chief Executive's Report**

- 5.1. Andy Marsh (AM) indicated that he felt one of the strengths of the Fundamental Review (FR) was that, as the report reflected and addressed what stakeholders had said they wanted to see from the College, they should give the College an opportunity to follow through.
- 5.2. Policing was in a period of unprecedented scrutiny, responding to high profile events such as the sentencing of Wayne Couzens (who used his police role to facilitate the murder of Sarah Everard) and the sharing of inappropriate images of the Bibaa Henry and Nicole Smallman crime scene by two Metropolitan police officers, and the consequent reduction in public trust in policing
- 5.3. The College should be relevant, dynamic and connected. After sentencing in those cases, there was an opportunity to discuss standards and the College's role in setting them, to seek to shore up public confidence that there were ways of dealing with bad police officers.
- 5.4. The Telegraph had published an article by AM about PEQF, prompted by a statistically significant survey of around four thousand new joiners, providing valid data on officer confidence entering the profession through the new routes. Although there had been hesitancy towards the new routes, it was not claimed the old routes were ideal either. Attitudes were changing and there was cause for optimism. John Apter had called for cultural change in the media and, if this was to be delivered, there was a need for leadership at all levels across the whole service. AM's article had not been without social media criticism, but there was a need for the service to get behind the entry routes. The entry routes would continue to improve, with the curriculum under review to ensure relevance, quality of delivery from Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) under scrutiny and supporting new officers' learning experience rather than being dismissive, with the quality of tutoring being key. Emerging data showed that that 47% of new appointees were aged 25+.
- 5.5. The College should intervene when it could in response to problems experienced by forces. AM's ambition was for it to be relevant in board rooms, chief officer rooms, OPCCs and the Home Office around vexed issues of the moment. As an

example, the College was jointly leading the Action on Inclusion and Race Plan, making a significant contribution devising an outcomes framework which would be publicised mid-December. Similarly, as part of the joint taskforce in VAWG, forces had been invited to contribute staff on a voluntary basis.

- 5.6. There was a need to raise awareness as there was a lot of good, relevant College work not being taken up by forces. An analysis of force use of specific digital products and opportunities was likely to show great variation, for example in the use of College Learn. AM would be publicising College products and services at December Chiefs' Council. College support in the selection of chief officers was appreciated, as was support for forces experiencing difficulties. Support could also be offered to newly appointed chief officers.
- 5.7. The Chair remarked that the Telegraph article had been well-pitched and was well-received in political circles.
- 5.8. Board members observed that there was an issue with new entrants and inappropriate social media use, which was also a reflection of wider society. It would be unfortunate if the College were blamed for this on account of the younger age and university vibe of new entrants. Bernie O'Reilly (BoR) clarified that the lines around the role of social media and inappropriate use were blurred, and not exclusively an issue with younger recruits. The officers involved in the Bibaa Henry case were experienced, not young in service, and yet shared the offending photo with some 50 colleagues.
- 5.9. AM advised that in his experience recruits were not like university students but were welcomed into the police family, strengthening emotional ties with the job and given extensive input into ethics, standards, behaviour and the duty to whistleblow.
- 5.10. Board members observed that College products had often been developed and essentially given away with little further involvement. Would there be an inspection regime in future, to look at how PEQF was being implemented? Should this be the role of the College or HMICFRS on the College's behalf? Implementation had always been the cause of reputational issues rather than the product itself. The College should be more involved with quality assuring delivery, especially where a product was licensed, as it tended to be the target of criticism even where not responsible for delivery.
- 5.11. Board members noted that regulation was needed because general accreditation tended to be very high level and did not go into the detail of the programme.
- 5.12. AM remarked that there was an opportunity to reframe the College's relationship with HMICFRS as appropriate. Some areas of College work were highly regulated, such as firearms

and public order. This was expensive and not suited to all areas. Ways of commercialising the College's intellectual property were under consideration. HEIs had their own inspection regimes but the Fundamental Review did support the provision of some implementation support.

- 5.13. Jo Noakes clarified that one of the benefits of the new routes was the quality assurance process from the beginning to sign off on the HEI. It then needed to come back once delivering, to evidence that it was doing what it undertook to do when signed off, so the quality assurance process was ongoing. This was not in place with IPLDP and forces were relatively new to using it. The leadership work was based on the same principles.
- 5.14. A policing board member suggested there was potential for communications on policing as a second career, building on a previous profession. Joiners in their force were a mixed profile of 18- and 19-year olds, and older joiners, including a 55-year old ex head-teacher.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the Chief Executive's update.

06-COP-NOV21

#### **Current issues in policing**

- 6.1. Iain Raphael (IR) updated board members on three operational areas.

#### **Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG)**

- 6.2. This work was being jointly led with DCC Maggie Blyth as part of a joint task force with NPCC, the College and seconded officers to support delivery. They were shaping the national and College framework, with short-, medium- and long-term areas of focus built around three pillars:

- Trust and confidence – the Code of Ethics review, updating the harm outcomes framework, reviewing counter corruption APP, the police-perpetrated domestic abuse super complaint, guidelines, the Leadership Centre and cultural change.
- Safer spaces – looking at approaches to problem solving and evidence-based guidelines.
- Perpetrator pillar – specialist training for DA investigators (DA Matters), child abuse and a new risk assessment tool (DARA).

The College would host the knowledge base, including What Works, own the evidence and evaluation strand of the programme, and shape the academic reference group. The first part of the plan would be presented at Chiefs' Council in December 2021.

- 6.3. The VAWG toolkit articulated what already existed in legislation and the protective measures policing needed to keep women safe. The toolkit would be presented to

Professional Committee in December and to the Board in January for Noting.

#### **Murder of MP David Amess**

- 6.4. The murder of David Amess on 15 October 2021 sparked discussion on protection of Members of Parliament (MPs). The national programme for protection of MPs was hosted by the Metropolitan Police Service. The College's role was to support consistency in approach by sharing products and facilitating cross-force collaboration. The scope could be widened by linking with mayors and Police and Crime Commissioners.
- 6.5. A live investigation was ongoing into the car explosion in Liverpool city centre on 14 November 2021. The threat level had been raised to severe, with all forces being asked to review policing plans for upcoming events and a winter vigilance awareness campaign to be run. The College would connect with this.

#### **Public Protest**

- 6.6. The College's role in the M25 Insulate Britain protests was to support the operational aspects: provide public order training, co-ordinate sharing of operational techniques and facilitate peer reviews. It was able to respond to service needs by amending training so sections on specific tactics could be delivered in a modular way to maximise reach. The College linked in with the Public Safety Board chaired by BJ Harrington.

#### **Discussion**

- 6.7. Board member discussions focused on VAWG and related diversity issues. They:
- noted that there were developing tensions in relation to the pace of delivery of the Diversity Equality and Inclusion (DEI) plan compared to the pace of delivery around gender and VAWG. The Stephen Port inquest report would prompt similar strong feeling around sexuality and an update should be provided at the next board meeting.
  - noted in relation to the VAWG plan that a distinction should be made between what was externally focused (relating to the community/society) and what was internal to the service, what was being done for staff.
  - suggested in relation to DARA that the College should consider going further than encouraging uptake.
  - noted, in relation to domestic abuse, that HMICFRS were inspecting arrest numbers, but other alternatives could also achieve positive outcomes when used appropriately, such as perpetrator programmes and conditional cautions. Any response should be evidence based and tailored to the individual case.



- 6.8. Andy Marsh (AM) remarked that where evidence was incontrovertibly overwhelming, the College should be more confident in issuing standards, and more consideration should be given to this in relation to DARA. A requirement to arrest took away discretion and positive action covered a wider spectrum of interventions.
- 6.9. IR observed that there was a need for quick response in relation to VAWG, with a focus on what the service could do itself and later extending to support from partners.
- 6.10. Rachel Tuffin clarified in relation to DEI that a lot of work was taking place in the background to establish governance and recruit to the scrutiny board, and this would be shared publicly once in place.
- 6.11. The Chair remarked that the College should be perceived as responding to issues, even where work was taking place behind the scenes. It should be forward looking rather than reactive. He indicated that the National LGBT+ Police Network had requested a meeting.
- 6.12. AM observed that where attention was shown to one group more than others, care should be taken not to disenfranchise other groups.

**ACTION: Iain Raphael**

Include an operational update on issues raised by the Stephen Port inquest report.

**ACTION: Martin Tunstall**

Meet with the National LGBT+ Police Network.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** and **discuss** the operational updates on current issues in policing

## Part two – Items for decision and discussion

07-COP-NOV21

### Review of Promotion and Progression

- 7.1. Jo Noakes (JN) provided a comprehensive overview of the Promotion and Progression Review report, circulated alongside these minutes. The aim of the review was to review current processes, identify good practice, ascertain opportunities for fundamental reform and allow development of a strategy to more effectively meet current and future requirements of the service.
- 7.2. The review produced nine recommendations, underpinned by a set of principles regarding: promotion for sergeants and inspectors in the long- and short-term, new promotion processes and standards to fill current gaps, continuing delivery of direct entry programmes, supporting progression with fast track programmes, and the competency and values



framework supporting all of these processes. These recommendations complemented the leadership centre work, with promotion and progression to be viewed as one strand of that work. They were also in keeping with the findings of the Fundamental Review.

- 7.3. Board members discussed the preliminary findings and recommendations. *[As these are not yet final, the details remain sensitive and have been removed from this version.]*
- 7.4. The Chair noted that the final version of the report would go to Chiefs' Council in February 2022, so consultation would take place in the meantime. The Home Secretary (HS)'s National Policing Board also had the Plan for Policing Leadership, of which the leadership centre formed a core element.
- 7.5. Martin Tunstall (MT) clarified that the HS' plan was the first expression of the national leadership centre; it had generated the HS' plan rather than just being part of it. Integrating it into National Policing Board work should facilitate a sense of collective development of the work from the outset.

**ACTION: Jo Noakes**

Circulate presentation notes.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Discuss and provide feedback on** the first draft of the review, with particular reference to the principles for reform set out in the report, as well as the specific recommendations, implementation of which are integral to the ongoing work of the Centre for Leadership.
- ii. **Note** that the final version of the review is scheduled for presentation to Chiefs' Council in Feb 2022.

08-COP-NOV21

**Decommissioning of the Assessment and Recognition of Competence (ARC) Process**

- 8.1. Jo Noakes (JN) explained that the ARC process was introduced in 2017 as a way for post-probationary constables to move from pay point 3 to pay point 4 following IPLDP, which was now being replaced by the new entry routes. Decommissioning was being recommended because the NPCC was planning to introduce a pay progression standard linking progression to the completion of personal development reviews and mandatory CPD, and a review found that the process was not being applied consistently by forces, with managers being insufficiently trained. Professional Committee agreed to recommend this course of action for board approval. In making the recommendation, consideration was given to impact on previous candidates, current demand on forces due to Uplift and the transition to the new entry routes, introduction of the new pay progression standards, and fairness and consistency for new officers. If approved by the Board, the Home Office would consult on

regulatory change at the Police Consultative Forum, following which the Home Secretary would be written to, to request an amendment to regulations.

- 8.2. Board members agreed to approve, with it being noted that learning from the less successful aspects of the ARC process should be retained and acted upon.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the decommissioning of ARC as an assessment process, giving authority for the College to work with the Home Office to remove ARC from regulations (Regulation 24 Annex F), and to notify forces of this professional intent.

09-COP-NOV21

### **National Special Constable Selection**

- 9.1. Jo Noakes (JN) advised that a standard application and assessment process has been developed for the Special Constabulary (SC) to ensure consistency across forces and enable better data collection and analysis at a national level, including pass rates by protective characteristics. Previous attempts to standardise recruitment into the SC had proved unsustainable. The College worked with the NPCC SC Working Group which was supportive of the proposal to use three stages of the police constable recruitment process: the standard application form, the pre-online sift, and the interview question bank. This approach would:
- provide a consistent end-to-end process, measured against the Competency and Values Framework
  - enable analysis of recruitment and impact on any particular group
  - link to the police constable process without being overly onerous for volunteers or changing any of the entry requirements
  - be straightforward for forces to implement as it would follow the process already being used for police constables, so likely to be cost neutral or cost saving.
- 9.1. Board members agreed to approve the proposal as recommended by the Professional Committee.
- 9.2. It was suggested that consideration be given to developing a route for regular officers to transfer into the SC when leaving full time policing, to retain their experience and keep them engaged.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the work undertaken to date.
- ii. **Approve** the adoption of a pre-assessment sift and standardised interview developed by the College of Policing as the national standard process for Special Constable selection, to include use of the National Application Form for Special Constables.
- iii. **Note** the benefits of the approach in facilitating data collection at a national level which in turn will enable detailed analysis of inclusion

and pass rates by protected characteristics, and a national equality impact assessment which has not been possible to date.

### Part three – Items for decision and discussion

10-COP-NOV21

#### **Evidence Based Guideline Development**

- 10.1. Board members had requested an introduction to the guideline development process to facilitate their review of specific guidelines for approval. Rachel Tuffin (RT) explained that it was a transparent and structured process which was borrowed from the NICE guideline process. The first published guidelines, on neighbourhood policing, were produced in six months, but others have taken longer. For context, the NICE guidelines process takes two years.
- 10.2. Comments submitted to RT by board members in advance of the meeting largely focused on implementation. The Neighbourhood Policing Guidelines had a very active chair who followed up implementation with colleagues. The Conflict Management Guidelines were embedded in the Officer Safety Training which were being updated. Reception by the service had been good so far, but there was more to do around implementation. With APP there was no assessment of impact after publication. Currently the implementation focus occurred at the end of the process, which could be improved on. Guidelines followed a continuous improvement process, with reflection taking place throughout and at the end of the process, looking at issues such as transparency and lay involvement.
- 10.3. One board member who had been on a Guideline Committee, observed that it was an excellent CPD opportunity which should be encouraged.
- 10.4. Board members welcomed the overview of the process, making the following observations:
  - Their responsibility as a board was to assure themselves that the process was appropriate and that it had been followed in any specific guidelines coming for approval.
  - Impact could be considered either up front, as part of a consultation, or after the event, to know what positive contribution had been made.
  - Currently, the choice of guideline topics was made as part of business planning. Could it be made by going out with proposals for consultation? RT clarified that the perennial issues, for which there had been support, were still being worked through, but there could be consultation or even possibly competition in the future.
  - It was suggested that a useful model for guideline papers coming to the Board for approval would be to include the basis of conclusions, with a summary of the main issues, the challenges raised through consultation, and how

these were reflected on or dismissed. Board members would feel they had actively fed into the process.

- NICE had moved away from using national leads as chairs of guideline committees because of concern over user bias and imposition of their views and were instead using health professional chairs. Had consideration been given to this? RT clarified that chairs were very carefully briefed and closely supported. The benefit of having national leads still outweighed the risks due to their role in supporting implementation. It would be preferable in the future to have chairs from other ranks if the implementation issue could be resolved.
- With regard to lay involvement, in areas where the evidence was weaker there was a need to raise public support for the guidelines. In health this was done through a complex structured consultation with the public, which was far more involved than having a lay person on the committee.
- At some point, a set of guidelines would attract significant controversy because professionals could not agree on the evidence. This would require protocols and governance structures to be watertight. RT indicated governance and protocols would be reviewed with this in mind.

10.5. The Chair noted that the guidance specified a minimum consultation period of six weeks but there was no indication of how long overall development took. Could this be speeded up or would it depend on the subject? RT advised that it varied according to the subject. There had been an imperative from HMICFRS in relation to the Neighbourhood Policing Guidelines, which led to focused resources. Where there were competing priorities, it could take longer. Target time was included as part of the business planning process, with any changes being flagged internally and externally where appropriate. This was not an area attracting concern about dynamism, but there could be greater understanding externally of the importance of following a systematic process.

10.6. Andy Marsh (AM) observed that too many experts could make guidance unworkable or interminable. There should be a balance between getting it right and timeliness. RT clarified that the guideline process was intended to reduce volume by stripping back to essentials. APP often represented voluminous guidance by and for experts. With guidelines, a mixture of people was involved, some deliberately from outside the specialist community so they could critique from the outset what would not work. She advised that there was a small number of guidelines focusing on perennial issues which had been raised repeatedly in inspection reports. If there was interest in doing more, it would need to come from

the service. Martin Tunstall observed that there was a hierarchy of guidance and this process would not be appropriate for everything. Different products were targeted at different audiences.

**ACTION: Rachel Tuffin**

Review guideline development governance and protocols to ensure robust in the event of challenge.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the guideline development process and areas for future development

11-COP-NOV21

**Effective Supervision Guidelines**

- 11.1. Rachel Tuffin (RT) advised that supervision was one of the perennial issues, raised in every investigation, critical for retention and key to the Uplift Programme. It was the first time there was enough performance evidence to make strong statements about performance. Previous leadership reviews had been unable to show what would deliver performance on the ground. The issue of making time for it and suggestions for implementation would be included at launch, including to implement one guideline at a time and gradually build a toolkit. There was good support from HMICFRS for implementation. A detailed implementation plan was prepared at Professional Committee's request.
- 11.2. Andy Marsh (AM) enquired how this would link to leadership development and whether CPD opportunities could be aligned to the recommendations. RT referenced three strands in the implementation plan:
  - Embedding of College products, which was already underway
  - Stakeholder CPD events
  - Targeted support on the ground, to help with engagement and activities in force.
- 11.3. Board members raised the issue of support for supervisors of persons not wanting to be supervised. Was organisational support sufficiently robust, especially in a temporary role? RT advised that this was an area of vulnerability that would be addressed in the implementation phase, through good practice case studies.
- 11.4. Board members noted that this work linked with the leadership centre and promotion and progression work in a cohesive way, but it would depend on implementation in force. How would this be evaluated? RT advised that College surveys were issued every two years, including some relevant indicators, and there was a wider set of plans for improving quality.
- 11.5. RT advised that publication was being planned for January, subject to fitting in with the wider strategic communications

plan. Timing would need to align with work being done internally in forces to support this. The Chair remarked that it aligned with discussions on the culture of policing. AM cautioned that it should not lead to an argument that policing wanted more supervision.

- 11.6. The Chair enquired whether the guidelines were tested more widely than the group working on their development, for example with chief constables or supervisors without a particular interest. Everything should be looked at through the lens of 'dynamic, connected, relevant'. How could we be sure the guidelines would be well received? RT clarified that there tended to be a turnover of fresh frontline personnel over the duration of the development work, volunteers rather than experts. Small focus group tests could be conducted.
- 11.7. Jo Noakes (JN) suggested that the same stress tester group could also be used to support communications. If the Supervision Guidelines were launched in January 2022 and the Promotion and Progression report was launched at Chief Constables' Council in February, a link could easily be made between the two for a coherent narrative.
- 11.8. Board members noted that the College usefully engaged with forces on a very frequent basis, but it was not always noticed and just needed to be formalised at times.
- 11.9. AM suggested there was an opportunity to test connection if he or others were to test the guidelines with a group of eight sergeants or acting sergeants. He agreed that the guidelines should form part of the narrative around leadership. User testing should be attempted, provided it did not conflict with the need for dynamism.
- 11.10. Board members noted that the College was already operating in these areas, for example in the wellbeing space, and it was about raising awareness. The guidelines could be used as a basis for CPD for supervisors if they were packaged up appropriately.
- 11.11. It was observed that, culturally, the system tended to be adversarial, with a focus on how not to get in trouble. The challenge was to move the focus to positive behaviours.
- 11.12. RT indicated that force communications from immediate supervisors and their chief would be key. If the support offered by the College was viewed alongside support from the chief officer team, it would be better received by officers.
- 11.13. It was suggested that it could be made part of the PCCs accountability to the chief, to enable its use as a lever.

**ACTION: Rachel Tuffin**

Explore the possibility of user testing with a small group of sergeants or acting sergeants prior to launch of the guidelines.



**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the development of the Effective Supervision Guidelines
- ii. **Approve** publication and release across the service.
- iii. **Approve** the proposed implementation approach and provide their views on the following areas:
  - Gaining the support of chief officers and senior leaders who are crucial to the acceptance and implementation of guidelines
  - Releasing the guidelines to the service and reaching the officers and staff who we want to implement and utilise them.

12-COP-NOV21

### **Environment Management Plan Progress**

- 12.1. Nick Bayley (NB) advised that the College was working to improve environmental sustainability across the estate and operations, and to meet government commitments and 2025 targets through its own action plan. The plan had been consulted on and was to work towards an ultimate target of net zero. Progress was measured against a comprehensive dashboard. Data gaps were being identified so they could be built up to support the targets. Delivery was on track for the current year.
- 12.2. Board members discussed driver training for electric vehicles. The risks were higher of hitting pedestrians and required changes in driving style. This was an issue for the service as a whole but there was potential for the College to take on a leading role. The NPCC was also conducting work on sustainability through a third party.
- 12.3. It was noted that the estate proposals considered previously were built around sustainability and achieving carbon neutral targets.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the report and attached dashboard.

13-COP-NOV21

### **Annual Report and Accounts 2020/21**

- 13.1. Clare Minchington (CM), as Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee, advised that the issue around the estates valuation had been resolved with some extra disclosure but no substantive changes required to the Annual Report and Accounts 2020/21 (ARA). The NAO Final Completion Report had been received. A fine had been shared with the Home Office (HO), which was declared and lessons learned for the future.
- 13.2. All directors had signed their declarations. Andy Marsh (AM) confirmed he had received sufficient assurance and was content to sign the letter of representation. CM was content to support approval of the accounts.
- 13.3. The photo of AM in both the ARA and Business Plan would be in uniform.



- 13.4. It was noted that the HO had been fined for misuse of IR35 off-payroll working rules and CM was asked whether she felt comfortable with the College's position on these. She indicated that a lot of work had been done on this when she first took on the role as Chair of ARC, but it would be revisited in light of the increased responsibility on organisations for due diligence.

**ACTION: CG**

IR35 rules to be reviewed by the Audit and Risk Committee.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the Annual Report and Accounts (ARA) 2020/21;
- ii. **Approve** the Letter of Representation;
- iii. **Note** the Audit Completion Report.

14-COP-NOV21

**Committee Effectiveness Evaluation**

- 14.1. Kate Fromant (KF) advised that the Board and committees were required to undergo annual effectiveness reviews, with these being externally administered every three years. These had been completed and were generally positive. Professional Committee members indicated that more board members should attend its meetings and they would like the opportunity to contribute to agenda items. This should be achievable following appointment of the new Non-Executive Directors (NED). All evaluations were being referred to the Nominations and Remuneration Committee (NRC) for development work. The Chair would hold exit interviews with each outgoing NED, which would also feed into this work.
- 14.2. Board development and induction had been raised by all four recommended NED nominees during their interviews. Professional Committee concerns about its relationship with the Board could also be explored as part of board and committee development. The Chair asked that a particular focus be given to the induction process whilst awaiting the NED appointments. NRC members offered their assistance.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the results of the Annual Effectiveness Evaluations
- ii. **Approve** plans of action to address any issues that have been raised.

15-COP-NOV21

**Forecast Budget Position Report**

- 15.1. The Board received an update on the College's financial position. *[As the details discussed are commercially sensitive, they have been removed from this version.]*

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the forecast budget position for financial year (2021/22).

16-COP-NOV21

**Performance and Risk Report**

- 16.1. Bernie O'Reilly (BoR), who had newly assumed responsibility for performance and risk, indicated that there were nine

strategic risks, two red and seven amber. The reds were Connection with the Service and Finance, in relation to the ability to plan longer term. These were accurately graded. Some of the amber risks were somewhat cautious and would be reviewed in the coming weeks.

- 16.2. It was noted that the Covid-19 restrictions were tighter in Wales than in England, which was pertinent when planning face-to-face training.
- 16.3. Andy Marsh (AM) considered Finance to be the biggest risk in light of inflation, continuing uncertainty due to Covid-19 and the potential to be required to make savings. He remained optimistic for the College's role in the service and how it could be strengthened in the future.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the updates to performance, risk and internal audit.

## Part four – Conclusion of business

17-COP-NOV21

### Items for Noting

- 17.1. Items for noting which had been circulated comprised a Senior Management Team update, a Professional Committee update and the Stakeholder Information Bulletin. The items were noted without issue.

**Decision:** The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the Items for Noting bundle.

18-COP-NOV21

### Any Other Business

- 18.1. The Chair indicated that the report on the recommended Non-Executive Director nominees and candidate summaries would be circulated to board members in confidence.

### **ACTION: KF**

Circulate the report on the recommended NED nominees and candidate summaries to board members in confidence.

19-COP-NOV21

### Review of the meeting

- 19.1. Feedback was provided by Ian Wylie (IW) as one of the outgoing board members. He felt the meeting had been relaxed but focused, with clear papers, including two substantive papers on promotion and progression, and on guidelines. Leadership had been a theme of the meeting and showed promise for the College's future. He felt he could leave feeling optimistic about the future of the board.
- 19.2. The Chair indicated that it would be preferable for slides to be used when presenting longer papers.
- 19.3. The current venue had been selected for its proximity to Spring Gardens. Board members discussed the merits of balancing convenience with other objectives and the

potential gains of meetings being held in forces on a rotation basis. The force chief constable and association representatives could be invited to attend. It was agreed this should be explored for future meetings from early 2022.

- 19.4. The Chair requested that board meeting dates for 2022-23 be confirmed and circulated as soon as possible.

**ACTION: KF**

Dates for the 2022-23 board meetings to be confirmed and circulated as soon as possible.

**Camille Giffard, Governance Manager**

**Signed by the Chair as a true record of the meeting**

**The Rt Hon. the Lord Herbert of South Downs CBE PC (Nick Herbert)**  
**Date: 19 January 2022**